

SECRET

*CIA Internal Use Only  
Access Controlled by DDS*



CIA HISTORICAL STAFF

## The Support Services Historical Series

THE OFFICE OF TRAINING, 1 JULY 1951 - 1 JANUARY 1966

VOLUME V: THE LANGUAGE AND AREA SCHOOL  
AND THE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM,  
1 JULY 1956 - 1 JANUARY 1966

SECRET

OTR - 9

November 1971

Copy 2 of 3

## W A R N I N G

This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States, within the meaning of Title 18, sections 793 and 794, of the US Code, as amended. Its transmission or revelation of its contents to or receipt by an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

GROUP 1 Excluded from automatic downgrading and declassification
--

~~SECRET~~

*CIA Internal Use Only  
Access Controlled by DD/S*

THE SUPPORT SERVICES HISTORICAL SERIES

OTR - 9

THE OFFICE OF TRAINING: 1 JULY 1951 - 1 JANUARY 1966

VOLUME V: THE LANGUAGE AND AREA SCHOOL  
AND THE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM,  
1 JULY 1956 - 1 JANUARY 1966

*by*

[REDACTED]

25X1

November 1971

25X1

[REDACTED]

Hugh T. Cunningham  
Director of Training

HISTORICAL STAFF  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. The Language and Area School . . . . .	1
A. Introduction . . . . .	1
B. Background . . . . .	4
1. Programs . . . . .	4
2. Organization and Personnel . . . . .	6
C. Organization, Staff, and Status, 1 July 1956 . . . . .	7
D. The Language Development Program . . . . .	10
1. Origin . . . . .	10
2. Voluntary Language Training . . . . .	13
3. Language Development Awards . . . . .	15
4. The Proficiency Testing Program . . . . .	17
E. The Tutorial Training Program . . . . .	18
F. Area Training . . . . .	19
1. Background . . . . .	19
2. Major Area Training Programs . . . . .	22
a. Country Studies . . . . .	22
b. The Americans Abroad Orientation . . . . .	23
3. Other Area Training Programs . . . . .	26

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

a.	Introduction to Overseas Effectiveness . . .	26
b.	The Senior Area Seminar . . . . .	28
4.	Termination of the Area Training Program . . .	29
G.	Special Activities . . . . .	31
1.	Interagency Roundtables . . . . .	31
2.	Programmed Instruction . . . . .	33
3.	Isolated Training Facilities . . . . .	33
H.	Summary and Evaluation . . . . .	35
II.	The School of International Communism . . . . .	37
A.	Background . . . . .	37
1.	Early Courses in Communism . . . . .	37
2.	Establishment of the School . . . . .	38
B.	Organization and Key Personnel . . . . .	40
1.	Staffing . . . . .	40
2.	Key Personnel . . . . .	41
C.	Major Programs . . . . .	43
1.	Introduction to Communism . . . . .	43
2.	Communist Party Organization and Operations . .	44
3.	Anti-Communist Operations . . . . .	46
4.	USSR -- Basic Country Survey . . . . .	47

SECRET

SECRET

5. China Familiarization . . . . .	48
D. Overseas Training . . . . .	49
E. Headquarters Tutorial Training . . . . .	51
F. Non-Agency Activities . . . . .	52
G. Summary and Evaluation . . . . .	56

Appendixes

A. Agency Language Training, A Decade of Experience 1954 - 1964 . . . . .	58
B. Language Incentives . . . . .	90
C. Sources . . . . .	97

SECRET

SECRET

THE OFFICE OF TRAINING, 1 JULY 1951 - 1 JANUARY 1966

Volume V: The Language and Area School

and the School of International Communism,

1 July 1956 - 1 January 1966

I. The Language and Area School

A. Introduction

Late in 1955, OTR's language training activities came to be of major concern to Agency officials at the highest levels. It appears that not until that time did they realize that the Agency's support of language training was not compatible with the Agency's need for language competence -- this in spite of Mr. Baird's constant efforts to enlist high-level support for language training. In any event, in the fall of 1955 the DCI decided to put the power of his position behind the systematic development of language competence in the Agency. This decision resulted in the launching of a number of language development programs during the following ten-year period, programs that are described in the pages that follow.

SECRET

SECRET

By early 1964, OTR's language training activities had increased in number and complexity to the point where existing policies and standards no longer provided adequate controls, and it became apparent that there was a need for an official Agency language training policy. The actual development of this policy was an extended process involving Agency-wide coordination; the process was not completed until after January 1966 and thus much of it is not within the time-span of this report. The early steps, however, were taken during the 1956-66 period and therefore are covered here. Among these early steps was the preparation of background papers to support policy planning.

One of these papers was prepared by Dr. [ ] in July 1964. At that time, Dr. [ ] was Deputy Chief, Language Training, Language and Area School (LAS). His paper was "a retrospective look at ten years of experience in language training in the Agency" and covered the period from 1954 to 1964 (see Appendix A\*). In December 1966, Dr. [ ] -- then Chief of the Language Training

25X1

25X1

25X1

---

\* Page 58.

SECRET



SECRET

School -- prepared another background paper, this one covering the history of the "incentive awards" program from its inception in February 1957 to its termination in August 1963 (see Appendix B\*).

These papers constitute, in effect, a somewhat detailed history of the major developments in the language training program of LAS during the 1956-66 period. The present coverage will not repeat the contents of these papers but will identify their salient features and will supplement the information they contain. The papers do not, however, cover area training; that will be discussed here at some length.

The following sections, then, will establish the background for the 1956-66 period of the LAS, describe the organization and staffing of the school as of 1 July 1956, and discuss briefly the Language Development Program and its major components; it will describe the Voluntary Language Training Program, the Tutorial Program, and the Area Training Program; and it will cover briefly some of the special activities of the LAS during the period.

---

\* Page 90.

SECRET

SECRET

B. Background\*

1. Programs

Before OTR came into being early in 1951, language training was arranged externally by the individual components of the Agency. With the establishment of OTR, language training became one of the responsibilities assigned to the new Office, and Mr. Baird began to make some order out of the near chaos. As early as March 1951, he made an attempt to get systematic estimates of component requirements for language training\*\*; but the components failed to respond, and external language training on an individual-request basis continued to be the going procedure. In the summer of 1951, Dr.  25X1

25X1

was brought in to develop an internal capability for language training, including a language laboratory\*\*\*; and in September 1951, the OTR External Training Division became

---

\* OTR's activities in language and area training from July 1951 to December 1953 are described in Volume I of this history (OTR-5), pages 49-62; Volume II (OTR-6), pages 112-120, continues the coverage to July 1956.

\*\* See OTR-5, pp. 51-53.

\*\*\* OTR-5, p. 52.

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

the Language Services Division.\* By the end of 1953, the internal capability had developed to the point where almost as many students were taking internal courses as were taking external courses.

During that period, area training was closely linked with language training, and what little area training there was was done in external facilities. Some major attempts were made to establish adequate area training programs,\*\* but these were not successful. By the end of 1953, however, some progress had been made in Agency participation in area programs conducted by the Department of the Army.

From December 1953 to July 1956, there was no major breakthrough in either language training or area training. The internal capability for both continued to develop, however, and by the end of the period almost all language training was provided internally, and three internal area training programs had been established.\*\*\* In late 1955, there were beginnings of breakthrough in both language and area programs; these will be discussed later in this section.

---

\* See OTR-5, pp. 58-60.

\*\* See OTR-6, pp. 117-119.

\*\*\* See OTR-5, Figure 4, p. 121.

SECRET

SECRET

2. Organization and Personnel

As noted above, Dr. [ ] served as Chief of the Language Services Division from the summer of 1951 to June 1953. At that time, the Division was composed of the chief, three instructors, one laboratory technician, and two clerk-typists. Dr. [ ] followed Dr. [ ] and in December 1953 the name of the division was changed to the External and Language Training Division.\* Between June and December 1953, two additional instructors were added to the staff. In early 1954, Dr. [ ] got approval for the use of "contract" instructors -- usually US citizens with native-speaking foreign language ability, employed on a part-time basis -- and by the end of the year several of the "exotic" languages were being taught by these instructors.

In December 1954, the name of the division was changed to the Language, Area, and External Training School,\*\* informally abbreviated to LETS. By the time that OTR was reorganized in June 1956, it had been decided that the external training responsibility

---

\* See OTR-5, Figure 4, p. 121.

\*\* See OTR-6, Figure 1, p. 4.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1 would be transferred to the registrar section of the Support Staff, and  
the name was changed to reflect this transfer -- the Language and  
Area School. \* Dr. [ ] continued as chief of the LAS until 12 Janu-  
ary 1965, when the school was abolished and replaced by the Language  
Training School (LTS). 1/\*\* At that time, Dr. [ ] resigned from 25X1  
the Agency, and Dr. [ ] was named chief of the LTS. At that time  
also, the area training program was abolished. \*\*\*

C. Organization, Staff, and Status, 1 July 1956

25X1 Perhaps the best description of the organizational structure  
of the LAS in July 1956 is provided by a December 1955 report from  
Dr. [ ] to the DTR. 2/ Although this report established the struc-  
ture as of December 1955, that structure was in effect throughout 1956  
and -- with modifications -- for some years thereafter. The various  
activities of the school were divided among six "coordinators." [ ] 25X1

25X1 [ ] was Coordinator for Area Program Development, William

---

\* See OTR-6, Figure 3, p. 10.

\*\* For serially numbered source references, see Appendix C.

\*\*\* Although the post-1956 developments are not properly "background"  
information, they are mentioned here to establish continuity of  
organization.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1 [ ] for Language Training Support, [ ] for Language 25X1  
25X1 Seminars, [ ] for Language Training Lecture Programs,  
25X1 [ ] for Language Curricula, and [ ] 25X1  
25X1 [ ] for Maintaining Intensive Training Standards (to be known as the  
25X1 Qualifications Advisory Group). \* In addition to the people named as  
25X1 coordinators, Dr. [ ] staff consisted of two full-time instructors,  
a laboratory technician, and six training assistants. The Chief of the  
School was a GS-15, four members of the teaching staff were GS-14's,  
and two were GS-11's.

Some measure of the scope of the many activities handled by the six coordinators and their assistants is provided by an OTR report of significant activities during fiscal year 1956. 3/ The significant activities of the LAS were reported as these:

Training provided or arranged by the School represented 1,263 individual requests. This total includes 678 at external facilities in area, language and other specialized training and 585 in area and language within the Agency. In addition, there were 1,434 persons in language self-study programs in the language laboratory.

---

\* The Qualifications Advisory Group had the responsibility for external training, which at that time was still assigned to the school.

SECRET

SECRET

An internal area program has been established to meet previously stated requirements. A total of 105 Agency persons received area training in 12 courses, including Basic Country Survey courses, Regional Survey courses and Americans Abroad courses. An increasing number of Intelligence Advisory Committee personnel also attended these courses.

The internal language training program has been significantly broadened in FY 1956 to include a larger number of languages offered, semi-intensive language courses, specialized language courses, workshops in Eastern European languages and in Russian, applied translation programs, intermediate and advanced language seminars, foreign language lectures, foreign language film presentations, and a foreign language dining room. The language laboratory has recorded an increasing number of native speaker tape recordings. A total of 629 Agency personnel received training in 55 courses, in 13 languages.

The language proficiency testing program to assess individual language proficiency in reading, writing, speaking and understanding foreign languages has been enlarged. Proficiency tests are used increasingly by Agency components for judging whether or not individuals possess the fluency required for selected assignments, as well as by the School for recommending appropriate levels and types of training. In FY 1956, a total of 24 language proficiency tests were administered in 13 languages to 102 persons.

The Director of Central Intelligence has recently approved a Foreign Language Development Program, designed by the School in consultation with representatives of other Agency components, providing for cash awards for achievement and/or maintenance of defined levels and types of language proficiency. This program will become operative upon publication of an Agency regulation now in preparation.

SECRET

SECRET

D. The Language Development Program

1. Origin

Although the initial impetus that led to the beginning of the Language Development Program is usually ascribed to the DCI,\* documentary evidence shows that Mr. Baird was the actual originator. In January 1955, he issued a long memorandum in which he stressed the pressing need for language competence in the Agency, implied the need for Agency support of language training, proposed the establishment of standards, and urged all components of the Agency to cooperate in observing the standards. 4/ The memorandum identified and defined qualifications for intensive language training, listed specific selection standards, and outlined procedures -- all of which reappeared more than two years later when the Language Development Program was established by regulation. 5/

There appears to be no record of the response, if any, to Mr. Baird's memorandum. Neither is there a record, of course, of Mr. Baird's two-year effort to achieve the official establishment of a language development program; undoubtedly he succeeded through

---

\* See Appendix B.

SECRET



SECRET

the kind of person-to-person missionary work with Mr. Kirkpatrick, the Executive Director, and General Cabell, the DDCI, that he so often used to get things done. There is, however, one indication that Colonel White, then the DDS, was a strong supporter of the project. In his 14 December 1960 Tenth Anniversary address to OTR personnel, Mr. Baird stated that "in January of 1956 the DDS assigned to OTR" the responsibility for producing a plan for an Agency language development program. 6/ Mr. Baird's bureaucratic language meant, of course, that the DDS had approved the development of the plan as it had been proposed by Mr. Baird.

Whatever the means employed, the end was achieved. The Agency regulation establishing the Language Development Program is dated 4 February 1957. Bearing the same date but probably issued a few days before the regulation was released, there appeared an Agency notice about the program. 7/ This notice is really a personal letter from Mr. Dulles to all Agency employees; it is chatty, informal, and charming. It begins with the sentence, "Each time I travel abroad, as I have done recently, I become increasingly aware of the necessity for greater proficiency in foreign language skills among our personnel." The text continues in the same vein -- for example, "I need the

SECRET

SECRET

cooperation of all of you . . . I am asking you to devote as much time as you will, on a voluntary basis."\* There is reference to the establishing of the program and to the provision for awards, and the text concludes with "I urge all of you to become familiar with the program and to participate in it to the maximum practicable extent."\*\*

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the 4 February 1957 regulation that followed Mr. Dulles' notice was its official establishment of an Agency policy on language training. Previously, language training had been generally recognized as desirable, and employees were encouraged to take it -- when the pressures of the job permitted it. Although the regulation did not make language training mandatory, it clarified and emphasized the importance of language training to career development and added monetary incentives that attested to the Agency's high evaluation of the importance of the training.

25X1 \* According to Hugh Cunningham, who at the time was Chief of the Southeast Europe Division, Mr. Dulles had just returned from a visit to  He had an appointment with the Prime Minister and was escorted to the government building by the Deputy COS, who neither knew where the PM's office was nor was able to ask for directions. They wandered, and Mr. Dulles was late for the meeting.

\*\* To raise the question of who may have prepared the text of this notice borders on lese majeste; but if someone did, he succeeded well in capturing the essence of Mr. Dulles's personality.

SECRET

## 2. Voluntary Language Training

One of the important parts of the regulation's statement of policy was that which dealt with voluntary language study -- done at the employee's own initiative and on his own time. The regulation stated that this kind of study was "particularly encouraged," and the encouragement was enhanced by monetary awards greater than those given for directed study during work hours. Employees were quick to respond to this kind of encouragement, and the number of "after-hour" and "before-hour" classes increased rapidly after the publication of the regulation. By 1 July 1960, for example, the number of Voluntary Language Training Program (VLTP) classes had increased from a scattered few in 1957 to 33, with 237 students studying nine different languages. 8/

The problem of providing instructors for the VLTP classes was solved by finding Agency employees with the language fluency necessary to the teaching job. These people were, of course, paid for their "moonlighting." The LAS instructors provided supervision and guidance for the VLTP classes, but only rarely did they do

SECRET

the actual teaching. 9/ Needless to say, there was seldom much difficulty in finding Agency people who were completely competent in almost any language for which there was a demand.

In the latter half of 1960, an interesting situation developed in the VLTP. Up to that time, there had been heavy enrollments in beginning classes in French, German, Italian, and Spanish. It appeared that this emphasis on the so-called "soft" languages was not consistent with the Agency's needs and that students were more interested in the awards than in useful language competence. The Agency Committee for Language Development -- an oversight group established by the regulation -- decided to phase out these beginning courses, and by the end of 1960 the phase-out was completed. Between that time and March 1961, there were only 150 students in the VLTP, most of them in intermediate-level courses and seminars. In March 1961, the beginning courses in the "soft" languages were reinstated, and during that year 378 students were enrolled in them, bringing the 1961 total of VLTP students to 528. 10/ There appears to be no record of the rationale behind the reinstatement of the beginning courses, but it

SECRET

SECRET

could be conjectured that the experiment reflected the beginning of doubts about the validity of the incentive awards program -- doubts that subsequently led to the termination of the program.

### 3. Language Development Awards

One provision -- perhaps the key provision -- of the Language Development Program was the establishment of monetary awards for language study. The "incentive awards" as they were called, are discussed in some detail in Appendix B. Only a brief summary and recapitulation is provided here.

The implementing regulation provided for two categories of awards 11/ -- Achievement Awards, those granted for achieving proficiency in a language for the first time and for increasing the level of proficiency to the next higher awardable level; and maintenance awards, those granted for maintaining an awardable level of proficiency in a language. Achievement awards were not made for language proficiency possessed as of the date of the regulation or for proficiency already possessed by people entering on duty with the Agency after the date of the regulation. Maintenance awards were not made for

SECRET

SECRET

proficiency acquired prior to Agency employment by residence abroad or family association or for proficiency representing the primary reason for employment with the Agency.

From the beginning of the incentive awards program, there was a conflict of interests. The program was designed to serve the Agency's needs for foreign language proficiency; the program was used by individuals to serve their own needs for additional income.\* In December 1958, in an attempt to diminish the personal-interest use of the program, the implementing regulation was revised to cut the awards in half. 12/ In May 1960, another revision again cut the awards in half. 13/ By March 1963, the maintenance awards had been eliminated, 14/ and on 5 August 1963 -- on the recommendation of the DTR and the approval of the DDCI -- the entire incentive awards program was terminated. 15/

---

\* It was common knowledge at the time that a few Agency officers -- most of them, unhappily, in the higher GS grades -- managed to bypass the safeguards built into the regulation and get awards in a dozen or more languages. One of them, a GS-15, boasted that he had collected awards in 23 different languages.

SECRET

SECRET

With the demise of the incentive awards, the VLTP began to wither away; in September 1965 it was "suspended," and a year later it was terminated.\* There is no recorded official evaluation of the incentive awards program and no authoritative judgment on whether it was a failure or had served a good purpose. If it did serve a good purpose, there still remains the question of whether or not that purpose was worth the \$765,562.50 paid in awards during the six years of the program's life.\*\* 16/

#### 4. The Proficiency Testing Program

Although LAS and its predecessors had always done language proficiency testing in the course of normal placement of students in language courses, the incentive awards program created vastly greater requirements for proficiency testing. Awards were granted for having achieved certain levels of competence and for having maintained certain levels of competence. A definite measurement for each

---

\* See Appendix B.

\*\* The concept of monetary awards for achievement of foreign language competence was not entirely abandoned by the Agency. In December 1966, the Language Development Committee was debating the inclusion of the incentive awards in a new Agency language training policy under discussion at that time (see Appendix B).

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

of the levels had to be determined, and tests to coincide with the measurements had to be devised and administered. The intricacies of this problem and the various solutions of it are described in detail in Appendix A. It need only be said here that the problem was one of major proportions and its solution was one of the outstanding achievements of the LAS during the 1956-66 period.

E. The Tutorial Training Program

The tutorial language training program is described in detail in Appendix A. In brief, it was a device that made it possible to give language training to Agency employees who, for a variety of reasons, could not enroll in regular courses and to employees in deep-cover status who could not enter Agency buildings. The "tutors" were, for the most part, wives of Agency employees. The program was begun in January 1960, and by May of that year about 40 students were enrolled in the program.

In April 1963, the program reached a peak enrollment; about 100 students were in tutorial training at that time. LAS had a roster of 100 cleared tutors -- not all of them, of course, active at the same time; and training in 26 languages was available. During the period from April through August 1963, the cost of the tutorial program --

SECRET



SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

for instructors' salaries only -- was more than \$800 a month. Of the students trained tutorially from January of 1960 to July 1964, about 75% were DDP personnel. The program continued through 1965, and at the end of that year the LAS had the capability of providing tutorial training in 49 foreign languages and had added the capability for the teaching of English to foreigners, a frequent covert training requirement.

F. Area Training

1. Background

As noted in earlier volumes of this history, \* OTR had no internal area training programs during a greater part of the 1951-56 period. Some area training was done externally, primarily in courses given in Defense Department facilities; but OTR had no internal capability for area training, and what little was done in the Agency was done by other components for their own people. The actual origin of OTR's area training program is shown in a November 1954 memorandum from the DTR to the DDCI, written in response to what must have been an informal oral query. 17/ This is the text of the DTR's memorandum:

\* See footnote, p. 4, above.

SECRET

SECRET

The answer to your query of 30 October, "What are you doing with respect to indoctrinating dependents before overseas assignment, "is, -- "nothing!"

The Office of Training has felt for some time that the indoctrination of dependents before overseas assignment is one aspect of the larger problem of Area Training.

Area Training, as such, is presently not formally offered in CIA. The area divisions give what they call a briefing to stenographic and professional employees prior to their going overseas. These briefings vary from good to bad, depending upon the desk concerned. There is no standard and no uniformity. So far as I know, the desks offer no briefing to wives or dependents.

The Central Processing Branch of the Office of Personnel gives some briefings to employees going overseas. What is given, I am told, is excellent.

The Office of Training proposes that it be given the authority to institute an Area Training Program. Such a program would consist of area courses to be given both within the Agency and outside the Agency on an intensive basis, the courses to consist of historical, political, anthropological, cultural and social material on those countries in which the CIA has an interest. Ultimately, we suggest that all employees of the Agency be required to take such courses provided the nature of their work requires a knowledge of the country concerned.

An adjunct to the above courses would be a short area training course for the wives and adult dependents of employees assigned overseas.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1

To date no such requirement has been levied on the Office of Training, and we are not staffed to do the type of job we would like to do. We have, however, as you know, made a "guinea pig" approach to this in the form of a training film [ ] geared to female employees of the Agency and wives of employees of the Agency who will be sent [ ] If this proves successful and economical, the program could be expanded.

25X1

The routing sheet under which the DTR's memorandum went to the DDCI -- probably hand-carried by Mr. Baird -- was initialed by General Cabell, then the DDCI, on 5 November and returned to Mr. Baird with General Cabell's handwritten comment:

Please draft a Directive to yourself along the lines of our conversation 4 Nov, for my sig. Establish in that Directive the ultimate goal but require piece meal performance toward its attainment.

There appears to be no documentary evidence that the "Directive," as such, was ever actually prepared; but the job of initiating an area training program was assigned to the chief of the OTR Plans and Policy Staff and the chief of the then Language, Area, and External Training School. By July 1955, a proposal had been prepared and had been approved. 18/ Soon thereafter, two OCI area specialists, Dr. [ ] were transferred to OTR to develop the area training program. By July 1956, two "country studies" courses had been introduced -- one on [ ]

25X1

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

25X1 and one on [ ] -- and the Americans Abroad Orientation (AAO) program had been initiated with courses on [ ] the Middle East. 25X1  
19/

2. Major Area Training Programs\*

a. Country Studies

The "country studies" courses consisted of two kinds, country surveys and regional surveys. To the country studies courses 25X1 on [ ] developed before July 1956, courses on [ ] 25X1  
the Indian Subcontinent, the Arab States, [ ] Africa South of the 25X1  
Sahara, Nationalism and Communism in the Arab World, and the  
National Interest of the US in the Middle East were added during the  
latter half of 1956 and in 1957. During the following two years, courses  
25X1 on [ ] \*\* were introduced.

\* The undocumented data used in this section are drawn from OTR catalogs, bulletins, and announcements issued during the 1956-66 period. All are in the files of the OTR Instructional Support Staff.

\*\* This was called the China Familiarization Course. It was developed at the request of the Far East Division of the DDP, and it was offered at regular intervals until the termination of the Area training program.

\*\*\* This was called Basic Country Survey -- USSR. Early in 1960 the course was transferred from the LAS to the School of International Communism.

SECRET

SECRET

Thereafter, all of the country studies courses were available and given "when requested" until January 1965, when the area training program was terminated. The courses were given on a part-time basis, varying in duration but usually scheduled for 60 hours of classroom instruction, and tailored to the requirements of the students. Most of the students in the courses were DDP officers preparing for specific overseas assignments.

The area training staff that handled the country studies courses -- as well as most of the other area training programs

25X1 -- was composed of Dr. [ ] a specialist on Western  
25X1 Europe; Mr. [ ] a specialist on Africa and the Near East;  
25X1 Mr. [ ], a DDP Far East specialist detailed to OTR  
on a long-term basis in 1957; and Mr. [ ] another DDP 25X1  
Far East specialist detailed to OTR in 1958.

b. The Americans Abroad Orientation

The Americans Abroad Orientation (AAO) courses were designed to provide Agency employees -- both professional and clerical -- and their adult dependents with the basic information they needed to prepare them for a first-time assignment to a specific overseas area. Each course consisted of from 15 to 18 hours of classroom

SECRET

SECRET

instruction concerned with social customs, cultural and national attitudes and sensibilities, and other matters affecting overseas duty in a particular country or area. The OTR Catalog published in June of 1956

25X1 lists five AAO courses: the Arab States, [REDACTED] 25X1

[REDACTED] By the beginning of 1960, courses on the Middle East, 25X1  
Free Europe, [REDACTED] had been added;  
and by July 1961 the area training staff was capable of giving courses  
on 73 individual countries and world regions. 20/

25X1 Some measure of the quantitative scope of the AAO  
program is provided by a sampling of registration records. In fiscal

[REDACTED]

also indicate the expansion of the AAO program during the early 60's, an expansion that took place, according to Mr. Baird, "despite the fact that the absence of an Agency policy on enrollment of Agency

SECRET

SECRET

employees and adult dependents means that probably only half of the persons going to a given area for the first time are enrolled in the appropriate AAO." 21/

The AAO program continued to expand after 1961, still without an Agency policy on attendance and without any increase in the area training staff. In July 1964, the chief of LAS informed the DTR that the program could not go on at its then current level without an increase in staff. 22/ At that time, however, there was a severe budget pinch, and the area training staff could not be increased. An alternative -- a major reduction in the number of AAO's offered -- was suggested by Dr.  then Deputy Chief of LAS for Area Training; and in July 1964, the DTR recommended this to the DDS. 23/ The DDS approved this recommendation in August, and the DTR assigned the chief of the OTR Plans and Policy Staff (PPS) to make a study of the problem of reducing the offerings. In September, the C/PPS reported that even a curtailed AAO program was beyond the capability of the small area training staff and recommended, in effect, that the AAO program be abandoned and replaced by a program of "guidance

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

for personal adaptation overseas." 24/ Subsequent study by the C/PPS arrived at the conclusion that the AAO program should be abandoned entirely, and on 12 January 1965 this came about. 25/

3. Other Area Training Programs

a. Introduction to Overseas Effectiveness

At some time in late July or early August of 1958, the DDP Chief of Operations -- then Mr. Richard Helms -- suggested informally to the DDTR -- then Mr. [ ] -- that OTR develop a course of training directed toward improving the effectiveness of Agency personnel overseas by giving them an understanding of "what makes foreigners tick." 26/ The Helms suggestion was referred to Dr. [ ] who assigned the follow-up task to Mr. [ ] and Dr. [ ]. On 20 August 1958, Dr. [ ] submitted to the DTR the [ ] plan\* for a course to be called Introduction to Overseas Effectiveness (IOE). 27/

25X1

25X1

25X1

---

\* Actually, the plan was a team effort involving Dr. [ ] other members of the area training staff, and a professional anthropologist brought in on contract as a consultant. 28/

25X1

SECRET



SECRET

The plan was eventually approved, and the first course was given in December 1959 for 19 Agency officers in the middle and upper GS grades. 29/ The course was given a second time -- with the "Introduction to" of the title changed to "Principles of" -- in February and March 1960 and a third time in April and May 1961. 30/ It was a full-time, two-week course, using both Agency and non-Agency experts as guest speakers, and Dr.  acted as chief instructor and coordinator. In the second and third runnings of the course, most of the students were at or above GS-14 level, and most of them were DDP officers.

25X1

After the third running, it was decided, apparently, that the name of the course should be changed, the level of sophistication should be raised, and even more prestigious speakers should be engaged. The October 1961 OTR Bulletin contains a three-page article announcing that OTR had developed plans for a "Human Relations Program" and that the first segment of this program would be a "new" course called "Interpreting Foreign Cultures: Clues for Analysis and Operations." Although the article does not so state, the "new" course was the Overseas Effectiveness course warmed over -- the description clearly identified it as such. The rhetoric of the Bulletin article

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

is enthusiastic -- almost lyrical. It says that the new course "packs a liberal education in behavioral sciences in ten short days," that "the many intriguing aspects of social communication are explored by an international authority with a flair for entertainment," and that "our roster of speakers -- some with international reputations and all with outstanding knowledge and stimulating delivery -- is our pride and joy." The article concludes with the statement that "plans are under way for an early 1962 running of the course."

Just what happened to these somewhat grandiose plans appears to be unrecorded; it is probable that budget pressures killed them. In any event, neither the January 1962 OTR Schedule of Courses nor the August 1962 Catalog of Courses mentions either the "Human Relations Program" or "Interpreting Foreign Cultures: Clues for Analysis and Operations." Both publications, however, list Principles of Overseas Effectiveness. It can only be assumed that once again a noble effort had been blighted by the frost of the budget.

b. The Senior Area Seminar

Another noble effort in area training did, however, come to brief fruition. Early in 1959, Dr.  proposed and got approval for an advanced area training course called the Senior Area

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

Seminar. 31/ This was a two-week, full-time course designed for middle- and upper-grade DDP officers concerned with specific world areas. The first running of the course, called Free Europe -- Current Problems Seminar, was given in February and March 1959 for 16 students. Among the prestigious names on the roster of guest lecturers were those of Paul Nitze and Arnold Zurcher.\* The course was given a second time -- on the same world area -- early in 1960. Thereafter, for some unrecorded reason, it was abandoned.

4. Termination of the Area Training Program.

As noted earlier in this section, all OTR area training activities were terminated by a 12 January 1965 OTR Notice -- the same notice that abolished the Language and Area School and established the Language Training School. 32/ The official reason given at the time for terminating area training was the need to meet budget limitations. Unofficially, of course, other factors were involved. Chief among them perhaps, was the fact that neither the Agency as a whole nor the DDP had any policy at all about area training, but the DDP

---

\* At that time Mr. Nitze was President of the Foreign Service Educational Foundation, and Mr. Zurcher was Head of the Institute of Public Affairs and Regional Studies at New York University.

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

components were constantly levying special requirements for area training. The absence of policy made it impossible to project systematic plans for training; stated requirements often proved to be capricious, and actual registrations in area training courses meant little or nothing until a class actually met for the first time -- or even the second time. The continuous levy of special DDP requirements was made without regard for the limitations imposed on the size of the area training staff and without any intent to provide personnel or funds to help meet the requirements. Eventually it became clear that an orderly area training program within the capability of the existing staff was impossible.

With the termination of the area training program came the dispersal of the staff, which at that time consisted of only three full-time instructors. Dr. [ ] whose position as Deputy Chief, LAS, Area Training was eliminated, was reassigned to the Covert Action Staff of the DDP; Mr. [ ] was reassigned to the OTR Intelligence School; and Mr. [ ] resigned from the Agency. At the same time, Dr. [ ] resigned from the Agency, and Dr. [ ] took over as Chief of the Language Training School.

SECRET

SECRET

A sardonic footnote could be added to the somewhat unhappy history of area training by recounting the numerous post-1965 high-level expressions of the need for area training and the several specific high-level requests that OTR "look into" the possibility of developing one or another kind of area training.\* Such a footnote would have to include the fact that none of these expressions of need or specific requests was accompanied by a promise of policy or personnel or funds.

G. Special Activities

Like the other OTR schools, the LAS was constantly engaged in special activities related, either directly or indirectly, to the training mission. A few of these activities are mentioned here as illustrative of the kinds of things that were done.

1. Interagency Roundtables

25X1

In mid-1956, Dr. [ ] the chief of the LAS, devised the concept of an Interagency Language Roundtable, and his idea was warmly approved by the chief language training officers in other government agencies and departments. Dr. [ ] called the first meeting 25X1

---

\* Such requests were referred to the Intelligence School for "appropriate action." The opinions expressed here are those of the officer who was chief of that school at the time. 33/

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

of the group before the end of that year. \* By mutual agreement at the first meeting, it was decided that the organization would be unofficial and informal with a rotating chairmanship determined at each of the monthly meetings. The general purpose of the roundtable was to exchange information, discuss mutual problems, and to devise solutions that might be profitable to all of the members of the group. The roundtable also served as a medium for contact with the academic community and the consequent dissemination throughout the government of new academic techniques in language training.

A similar organization for area training was established at some time in 1958 -- the Interagency Area Training Roundtable. This group had the same pattern and purpose as the Language roundtable and, to some extent, the same membership; Dr. [ ] for example, attended meetings of both groups. Dr. [ ], of course, was the principal Agency representative to the area roundtable and was a frequent contributor of papers and other presentations at the meetings. He continued his membership in the group even after the Agency area training program was terminated.

25X1

25X1

---

\* See Appendix A.

SECRET

SECRET

## 2. Programmed Instruction

Initial experimental work in adapting the techniques of programmed instruction to language training is described in an earlier volume of this history.\* This experimental work was continued by the LAS throughout the 1956-65 period, and the guidance and facilities of the Center for Applied Linguistics of the Modern Language Association became available to support the work.\*\* At the end of July 1964, the deputy chief of the LAS stated in a report to the DTR that "although initial claims by proponents of programmed teaching have proven to be exaggerated, the principles of programmed teaching are already well established."

## 3. Isolated Training Facilities

One of the most effective language training devices used by the LAS was the isolated training site, a device that permitted intensive study of a foreign language and required functional usage of the language in a situation isolated from the usual distractions of the Headquarters training situation. This activity was initiated in 1956;

---

\* OTR-7, pp. 85-87.

\*\* See Appendix A.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1

25X1

[redacted] in a

fairly remote area [redacted] was rented and was equipped as a residence facility for small groups of students. Two groups used the house for three-day periods without incident; but the third, a French-language study group, ran into unexpected difficulties.\* Apparently the rural residents of the area had noticed the comings and going of the first two groups and had become suspicious enough to mount a home-spun surveillance operation. This operation revealed to them that both men and women were staying at the house at the same time, that some of them were orientals, and that mysterious electronic devices were much in evidence. These facts were enough to warrant reporting the insidious situation to police authorities. Because the house was in

25X1

[redacted]

The result was that on the second evening of the study session a [redacted]

25X1

[redacted] police task force raided the house and demanded explanations.

25X1

\* This summary of what happened at the isolated site is based on the recall of Dr. [redacted], who was deputy chief of the LAS at the time of the incident. 34/ In the files of the CIA Inspector General, there is an official report on the subject; that report was not used in this brief summary.

SECRET



SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

The detailed report submitted by the instructor who was in charge of the French-study group at the house states that the police were much concerned about the electronic devices on the premises. The officer in charge of the raid pointed to an encased movie projector and asked what it was. He was told that it was a movie projector. He asked what it was used for. The instructor replied, "We brought along some French films." After the misunderstanding generated by this reply was cleared up, the police were satisfied, and no arrests were made.

[REDACTED]

25X

25X1

The [REDACTED] site was hastily abandoned

25X1

thereafter, and in August 1957, an unused residence [REDACTED]

25X1

[REDACTED] was obtained by OTR for the

isolated training site purpose. This facility, called [REDACTED] was

25X1

used thereafter and served the purpose well -- and with insured immunity to police raids.

#### H. Summary and Evaluation

The foregoing discussion of the LAS activities has been limited largely to the period from July 1956 to January 1965 -- a year short of the stated time-span of this history. The January 1965 cutoff

SECRET

SECRET

point was chosen because that date marks the termination of the LAS, as such, and the beginning of the Language Training School (LTS); the interests of continuity will best be served by covering the total activities of the LTS in a later paper.

The greatest achievement in language training during the 1956-65 period was undoubtedly the establishment of the Language Development Program and its components, the voluntary training program and the incentives awards program. The rapid expansion of proficiency testing capabilities was, perhaps, a byproduct of the development program, but it was a notable achievement in itself -- as was the tutorial training program. Although the area training activities of the LAS came to a premature end because of budget pinches and the lack of supporting policy, they did achieve their objective during the period, and over the nine years of their existence they certainly made a major contribution to the overseas missions of the Agency.

SECRET

SECRET

## II. The School of International Communism

### A. Background

#### 1. Early Courses in Communism

As early as 1950, a course called Communist Party Operations was being given by the OSO/OPC Training Division. With the establishment of OTR in July 1951, the course continued as an offering of the "Covert" training component of the new office. In February 1952, it was transferred to the "General" training component of OTR as an offering of the Intelligence Training Division of TR(G);\* and when OTR was reorganized in December 1953, the course became one of the offerings of the Basic Training Division of OTR. In December 1954, the name of the course was changed to World Communism, and it continued to be a three-week, full-time course.\*\*

Throughout the 1951-53 period, a three-week course called Basic Intelligence Course (Clandestine Services) had contained a one-week phase on Communist ideology, history, methods, and tactics. In December 1953, this course became the Basic Intelligence Course

---

\* See OTR-6, pp. 7-8.

\*\* See OTR-6, p. 46.

SECRET

SECRET

(BIC) -- without the "Clandestine Services" limitation -- and retained the one-week segment on Communism. When the BIC was later changed to the four-week Intelligence Orientation Course,\* the Communism segment was expanded to two weeks and was called Introduction to Communism.

## 2. Establishment of the School

The establishment of the School of International Communism in June 1956 is described in detail in Volume II of this history.\*\* In brief, the rationale for the existence of such a school was based on the generally recognized need for broader and deeper training in Communist organization and tactics, a need that existed not only in the Agency but also throughout the government. Mr. Baird originally proposed that the School of International Communism (SIC) be developed in three phases: first, expanding instruction in the Agency; second, providing instruction for other government agencies and departments; and third, providing instruction for nongovernment groups and organizations. Mr. Baird's proposal was acted on by Gen. Cabell, the

---

\* See OTR-8, p. 46.

\*\* OTR-6, pp. 7 - 9.

SECRET

SECRET

Acting DCI at the time, who approved the establishment of the SIC and the first phase of development -- expanding the coverage of Communism within the Agency; the second phase he approved with qualifications; and the third phase he directed to be held in abeyance, pending the development of the first two phases.

The SIC was officially established in June 1956 by an OTR notice. 35/ Perhaps the best statement of the mission of the school at the time is that given by Mr. Baird in an official report covering OTR activities during fiscal year 1956 36/:

Its [SIC's] general mission is the development, coordination and conduct of training programs on all aspects of International Communism. Specifically, this school is developing and conducting courses at headquarters on the history, doctrines, organization, objectives, activities, and capabilities of International Communism; on special techniques of anti-Communist operations; and courses providing area knowledge of the USSR. As it is able, the school also provides instructors and instructional materials on request to training programs in the United States or abroad conducted by the Agency or by other government agencies for selected non-Agency personnel and foreign nationals.

SECRET

SECRET

This statement not only reflects the modification of the original three-phase plan but also provides for the SIC's activities in covert training and non-Agency services -- both of which eventually developed into major segments of the school's responsibilities.

B. Organization and Key Personnel

1. Staffing

Approval of the establishment of the SIC was granted with the predictable stipulation that there would be no increase in the number of personnel positions in OTR to accommodate the new school. To solve this problem, Mr. Baird used the rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul device of transferring positions from other OTR components and assigning them to the SIC. This action, of course, required officially approved action on the revision of OTR's table of organization. In August 1956, Mr. Baird sent his request for such approval to the Agency Management Staff. 37/ He proposed that positions be taken from the Basic School, the Intelligence School,\* the Support Staff, and the Operations School to provide a 15-person staff for the SIC. This staff would be

---

\* By August 1956, the Basic Training School and the Intelligence Training School had been merged into the Intelligence School, but the official table of organization had not been changed to reflect the merger.

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

composed of a GS-16 chief, two GS-15 instructors, three GS-14 instructors, four GS-13 instructors, one GS-12 instructor, a secretary, a training assistant, and two clerk-stenographers. 38/ The request for the new table of organization was approved; but at that time there was no requirement for a 15-person staff in the SIC, and the actual transfer of all of the positions was not made. Actually, the SIC never developed the requirement for such a large staff, and eventually the personnel slot-juggling that is so often employed to meet budget pressures cut the SIC staff to eleven positions, two of them clerical. 39/

2. Key Personnel

When the SIC was established in June 1956, Dr. Harry Rositzke was appointed chief.\* At that time, Dr. Rositzke was chief of the Operations School, and until October 1956 he served officially as chief of both schools. In October he was relieved of the Operations School assignment and continued as chief of the SIC until May 1957, when he returned to his parent component in the clandestine services.

25X1

Mr. [ ] was appointed acting chief of the school when Dr. Rositzke left, and a year later -- in May 1958 -- Mr. [ ]

25X1

---

\* See OTR-7, p. 16.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1 became chief of the school. From 4 August 1958 to 15 June 1959, Mr. [ ] attended the National War College, and Mr. [ ] a DDP officer, took his place. Mr. [ ] returned to the position thereafter and continued as chief of the school throughout the remainder of the 1956-66 period. \*

25X1

25X1

The key instructors in the SIC during the period from 1956 to 1960 were Dr. [ ]

25X1

With the

25X1 exception of Dr. [ ] who went to a rotational assignment in the DDP in 1963 and remained there for additional assignments, all of these men continued as SIC instructors throughout the 1956-66 period. Other OTR careerists who served as members of the SIC staff during parts of the period were Dr. [ ]

25X1

[ ] All members of the staff had specialized in Soviet studies for several years, and several of them were competent in the Russian language and the languages of the European satellites.

25X1 \* Early in 1970, the SIC and the Intelligence School were merged, and Mr. [ ] became chief of the new component, the School of Intelligence and World Affairs.

SECRET



SECRET

C. Major Programs\*

1. Introduction to Communism

As noted above, in September 1956 the one-week Communism segment of the Basic Orientation Course -- formerly the Basic Intelligence Course -- was expanded to a two-week part of the new four-week Intelligence Orientation Course (IOC) and was called the Introduction to Communism Course (ICC). Like the other two-week phase of the IOC -- Introduction to Intelligence, the ICC was, by Agency regulation, mandatory for all professional employees of the Agency.\*\*

The first official description of the ICC appeared in the January 1957 OTR Catalog. That description makes it clear that although the course was a part of the IOC, it could be taken separately -- that is, apart from the other half of the IOC -- as a prerequisite for more advanced courses in Communism. Although the course was primarily concerned with the international Communist movement, a considerable part of it was devoted to the development of Communism in the USSR and to the objectives and capabilities of the USSR. In 1957 a relatively

---

\* Undocumented course data are extracted from OTR Catalogs and Bulletins.

\*\* See OTR-8, p. 45.

SECRET

SECRET

small segment of the course was devoted to Communist China; in later years, of course, that coverage expanded considerably. Because the teaching methods used in the ICC were lectures, demonstrations, films, and basic readings, the only limitation on the size of the class was the number of students that could be accommodated in the classroom.

After the so-called "integration" of the JOT program in late 1958,\* a separate ICC was established for the JOT's. Although this was basically the same as the regular ICC, the depth of coverage was greater, more sophisticated methods of instruction -- such as seminars, role-playing, and live closed-circuit television [ ]

25X1

[ ] -- were used, and the course was extended to three weeks.

25X1

This special ICC for the JOT's continued from 1958 through 1965.\*\*

## 2. Communist Party Organization and Operations

The Communist Party Organization and Operations (CPO&O) course began in 1953 as a three-week course given by the OTR Intelligence Training Division.\*\*\* In December 1954, the name

---

\* See OTR-8, p. 53.

\*\* After 1965, the name of this course was changed to The Challenge of Worldwide Communism.

\*\*\* See OTR-6, pp. 101-102.

SECRET

SECRET

of the course was changed to World Communism -- probably to make a clear distinction between this course and a new course given by the Operations School, Anti-Communist Operations. When the SIC was established in 1956, the course became a part-time, 80-hour course, and the name became the CPO&O.

The prerequisite for the course was the two-week Introduction to Communism phase of the IOC. The coverage in the course was definitely slanted towards the needs of officers of the Clandestine Services; but other Agency professionals were admitted, and usually the classes had several DDI representatives. Basically, the course was concerned with Communist party organization, analysis of the structure and function of both open and underground parties and front organizations, and the methods used by Communist parties and fronts in exploiting their organizational assets. The CPO&O was a prerequisite for the more advanced course, Anti-Communist Operations.

SECRET

SECRET

3. Anti-Communist Operations

Before the SIC was established, the OTR Operations Training School had given the Anti-Communist Operations (ACO) course\*; by January 1957, the course had been transferred to SIC. 40/ The ACO was a half-time course, spread over four weeks and meeting a total of 80 hours in the classroom. One of the prerequisites was "projected assignment in Anti-Communist operations," 41/ a qualification that virtually limited enrollment to DDP officers. The seminar method of instruction was used, and the maximum size of each class was 15 students. The coverage of the content included the development of US anti-Communist operations; the vulnerabilities of various types of Communist parties; [REDACTED]

25X1

[REDACTED]

Beginning in January 1957, the ACO course was given twice each year by the SIC throughout the period up to 1966.

25X1

---

\* Dr. Rositzke was at that time considered by many people to be one of the foremost US authorities on Communism, so this advanced course remained in the Operations School as long as Dr. Rositzke was chief of the school.

SECRET

#### 4. USSR -- Basic Country Survey

As noted earlier in this paper,\* the area training program of the LAS had included a number of "Basic Country Survey" courses, each course devoted to a specific country or world area. One of these was a 60-hour course called Basic Country Survey -- USSR. OTR Catalogs show that at some time in early 1960 this course was transferred to the SIC. There appears to be no record of the making of the transfer or of the reasons for it; it could be safely assumed, however, that by 1960 the requirements being levied on the small area training staff had already become greater than the staff could meet. Also by that time, the SIC had demonstrated the capability for handling the course. Another factor, probably, was the logic of grouping all of the Communism courses in one school, and the USSR survey course could well be considered a Communism course.

The SIC offered the USSR survey course twice each year. Each class was limited to 15 students, and the schedule varied in format -- sometimes running full time for two weeks and sometimes half time for four weeks, usually depending upon the on-the-job requirements

---

\* P. 23.

SECRET

of the students. 42/ The course emphasized the current political, economic, social, military, scientific, and diplomatic developments in the USSR; as background for this coverage, some aspects of the history of Tsarist Russia were studied.

5. China Familiarization

After the termination of the OTR area training program in January 1965, the China Familiarization course was assigned to the SIC. Like the USSR survey course, the "China Fam" course had been developed by the LAS area training staff as one of the country survey courses; and, like the USSR course, it was as closely related to Communism as it was to area study. When the course went to the SIC, it retained its basic format -- one week, full time, with a 15-student limitation on the size of each class.

The first segment of the course was devoted to Chinese language familiarization. This part, handled by Language School instructors, was designed to give place-name and pronunciation familiarization, using a Romanization system. The second and larger segment was concerned with area familiarization; this was handled by the SIC staff, with the assistance of the  DDP Far East 25X1 Division and the Geography Division of the DDI Office of Basic

SECRET

Intelligence. 43/ "Area familiarization" was treated rather broadly and included some history, key personalities of the current regime, economic and scientific developments, and political activities. Originally, the course had been designed for DDP officers only; but as the position of Communist China on the intelligence priority intelligence list climbed higher, DDI officers began to take advantage of the availability of the course, and the composition of the classes changed.

D. Overseas Training

One of the responsibilities assigned to the SIC when it was established was providing tutorial training overseas for both US and foreign personnel.\* Such activity was done primarily for the clandestine services, and requests for overseas tutorials and briefings were usually channeled through the OTR Operations School after having been cleared by the training liaison officer of the DDP component concerned. The standard procedure was the writing of temporary-duty orders for the SIC instructor who was to do the training, with the requesting component paying the costs of the trip and doing the necessary planning and liaison work.

---

\* See p. 39, above.

The nature of the overseas training depended, of course, upon the individual situation; and each program was tailored to the specific requirements after careful consultation with the requesting DDP component. As a result, the content of the programs varied from condensations of one of the courses regularly given by the SIC at headquarters to detailed analysis of Communist activity in a single country or area.

25X1 For example, early in 1960 one of the SIC instructors went on TDY to

[redacted] his briefing covered the organization and operations of Communist parties -- a condensation of the SIC's Communist Party Organization and Opera-

25X1 tions course. 44/ On 16 March 1962, the chief of the SIC, Mr.

[redacted] left the US for [redacted] where he spent ten days

25X1 briefing the [redacted] intelligence service on Communist activities in

25X1 the Near East; from there he went to [redacted] to "guide the

25X1

25X1 [redacted] [intelligence] service in its assessment of the regrouping of

25X1 the [redacted] " 45/

These examples illustrate not only the wide variance in the coverage of the SIC's overseas training but also the difference in the kinds of groups trained; the [redacted] program was designed for US personnel, and the [redacted] programs were designed for foreign



SECRET

nationals. Throughout the 1956-66 period, the SIC's overseas training activities continued. The requirements never exceeded the SIC's abilities to meet them and still meet its other responsibilities, but there were periods when they were heavy. In one calendar year, for example, SIC instructors were involved in TDY assignments [redacted]

25X1

25X1

E. Headquarters Tutorial Training

Another responsibility assigned to the SIC was that of providing tutorial training, both overt and covert, in the headquarters area. In this activity, too, the programs had to be tailored to the individual situations. For example, early in 1960, in response to a request from the Department of State, SIC instructors briefed a group of 15 Latin American newspaper editors on Communist party organization and activity in Latin America. 47/ At about the same time, most of the SIC instructors were involved in a four-week, full-time covert training program for two senior members of the [redacted]

25X1

48/ In April 1960, five members of the SIC staff - [redacted]

25X1

25X1

[redacted] -- conducted a three-day covert briefing

25X1

for a group of [redacted] 49/

SECRET

The requirements for headquarters area tutorial training were greater than those for overseas training, but they were well within the capability of the SIC. In the six-month period from 1 April through September 1960, for example, the SIC provided 33 covert tutorial programs in the headquarters area; 50/ during the same period, the regular offerings of courses in Introduction to Communism, Communist Party Organization and Operations, and Anti-Communist Operations continued according to schedule. Perhaps the heaviest load of SIC activities came during fiscal year 1964, when the SIC provided 66 covert tutorial programs involving 164 full days in addition to regular course offerings -- at that time with the USSR survey course added. 51/

F. Non-Agency Activities

The capability of the SIC to meet the requirements for overseas training and headquarters tutorial training and at the same time to maintain a schedule of regular course offerings extended to a third non-course responsibility, participation in non-Agency activities. Although the SIC instructors were sometimes called upon to give lectures and briefings to nongovernment groups, the non-Agency activities were primarily training programs conducted by other US agencies and departments.

During the first four years of its existence, the SIC established a reputation for being the best qualified Communist training group in the US Government. By March 1960, SIC instructors were lecturing in training courses given by the Naval War College, the Air Command and Staff College, the Strategic Intelligence School of the Defense Department, the Naval Intelligence School, the Army Intelligence Course at Fort Belvoir, and the Foreign Service Institute of the State Department. 52/ By May 1963, other programs had been added to the list: the National War College, the Army Intelligence School at Fort Holabird, the Military Assistance Institute, the War Planning Group of the JCS, the AID Police Officials Course, the USAF Command and Staff College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the Army War College. 53/

Some of these organizations had several separate programs in which SIC instructors participated. For example, in 1960 the Foreign Service Institute had four programs: A Communism Course, a Junior Officers Course, a Midcareer Course, and a Senior Officers Course. During the six-month period from 1 April through September 1960, SIC instructors gave 23 lectures in these programs. 54/ During the April-September period in 1962, SIC instructors gave six lectures

at the Army Intelligence School at Fort Holabird -- four in the Senior Foreign Officers Course and two in the US Officers Intelligence Course. 55/ In 1962, the Foreign Service Institute initiated a Counterinsurgency Course in which SIC instructors made presentations -- as they did in counterinsurgency courses established by the US Information Agency and the Command and Staff College at Fort Bragg. 56/

Participation in nongovernment activities was a relatively small part of the total non-Agency activity of the SIC. The first nongovernment group to request an SIC speaker was the Brookings Institution. 57/ Mr. [ ] spoke at Brookings on "International Communism" in September 1960 and returned in May 1961 to give the same lecture. 58/ Also in May 1961, Mr. [ ] went to Sea Island, Georgia, to address the Association of General Counsels on "Communist Tactics in Latin America." 59/

25X1

25X1

Some measure of the scope of the SIC's non-Agency activities in lecturing is provided by a sampling of the SIC's weekly activity reports during the 1960-65 period. Early in October 1960, Dr. [ ] went to the Air Command and Staff College at Maxwell Air Force Base and gave a four-hour presentation on the Soviet Political System. 60/

25X1

25X1 On 28 April 1961, Dr. [ ] gave two two-hour lectures to the Regional

Seminar on China, sponsored by the Foreign Service Institute -- one on "Ideologies and Strategies: Marxist, Leninist, and Maoist" and one on the international Communist movement. 61/

During a single week in June 1961, SIC instructors gave six separate two-hour lectures to non-Agency groups: 62/ on 12 June,

25X1 Mr. [ ] spoke to the FSI Seminar on Communism on the theoretical background of Communism; on the same day, Mr. [ ] spoke to 25X1  
25X1 the same group on the political system of the USSR; on 13 June, Mr. [ ] addressed the FSI group on the economic potential of the 25X1  
25X1 USSR; on 14 June, Dr. [ ] gave a lecture on Communist philosophy to the Associate (Reserve) Course at the Strategic Intelligence School; 25X1  
25X1 on 15 June, Mr. [ ] addressed the same SIS class on the current status of the Communist movement; and on 16 June, Dr. [ ] returned 25X1  
to give a summary of the current strategy of the USSR.

This general level of non-Agency activity continued throughout the 1960-65 period. In his official report of OTR activities during fiscal year 1964, Mr. Baird stated that for the Departments of State and Defense alone, SIC instructors had given 150 separate presentations

representing 300 hours of platform speaking. 63/ Mr. Baird's statement did not, of course, mention that for every hour of platform speaking there were at least two hours of preparation and travel involved.

G. Summary and Evaluation

Although the SIC never formally developed the three major phases of activities originally proposed by Mr. Baird in 1956,\* it did -- in effect, at least -- serve the purposes that Mr. Baird had in mind: providing sophisticated training courses in Communism for Agency personnel, providing expertise in Communist activities for training programs given by other government agencies and departments, and providing the same kind of expertise for non-government groups and organizations. By early 1960, as mentioned above, the SIC had established a government-wide reputation for competence in the analysis of Communist activities and skill in the presentation of analysis.

If there was any single factor that insured the maintenance of the SIC's reputation over the years, it was probably the ability of the group to change analytical approaches and interpretations as Communism itself changed, both organizationally and strategically. During

---

\* See p. 38, above.

SECRET

the 1956-66 period, for example, the traditional concept of "International Communism" gradually broke down, and new concepts of regional and factional Communism arose. Also during that period, Communist China emerged as a priority in the study of Communism. Still other developments during the period were the rise of revolutionary governments and factions supported by Communism and the increasing emphasis on counterinsurgency training in the US Government. All of these developments directly affected the work of the SIC, and the record shows that the school was highly successful in keeping up with them.

SECRET

SECRET

Appendix A  
Agency Language Training  
A Decade of Experience

1954 - 1964

31 July 1964

Director of Training

Deputy Chief, Language Training

Agency Language Training

Attached is a retrospective look at ten years of experience in language training in the Agency. At the end I have added a look into the clouded crystal ball. I hope you find it of interest.



25X1

Attachment:

As stated above

SECRET



SECRET

## INTRODUCTION

25X1 The Language and Area School was first organized in the Office of Training in late 1951 and early 1952 as the Language Services Division. At that time it consisted of a Chief, 3 staff instructors, 1 laboratory technician, and a clerical staff of 2. A few part-time classes began on 1 March 1952; however, the bulk of the language training which was carried out by LSD was accomplished in various external institutions, governmental and private. Much of the training was conducted under contract with [ ] and the Foreign Service Institute, Dept. of State. This contractual arrangement existed until the Fall of 1953. Problems of security, expense, and lack of control of the substance of training made other methods appear desirable.

In the Fall of 1953, it was decided to shift from the previous contractual arrangements and to make fullest possible use of the language schools of other agencies of government. Students continued to attend the Foreign Service Institute with which a contract was maintained. Arrangements were made to send students also to the Navy Language School, the Army Language School and the National Security Agency. In addition a few part-time classes continued to be taught within the

SECRET

School. By this time the instructor staff had been increased only slightly, from 3 to 5 and the name of the school had changed to Language and External Training School.

By the Summer of 1955 it had become apparent that the use of other agency facilities could be counted on for only a part of our training effort. Many of the cost and security problems inherent in the external contracting approach were also present in the use of other government facilities. Our policy then became one of taking full advantage of all available, suitable external programs, especially of other agencies, but simultaneously of developing our own resources to meet our needs which could not be met elsewhere with consideration for substance, cost, and security. The addition of area training occurred also in 1955 and the school was reorganized and became the Language and Area School.

The purpose of this paper is to describe and comment on the development of internal language training programs in the Language and Area School and the Agency. This process, which has been going on for about ten years, began during the experimentation period 1952-54 and has been since 1955 a significant part of the Office of

SECRET

Training's efforts in behalf of the professional growth of the Agency.  
Ten years and nearly nine thousand students appear to warrant a backward glance.

SECRET

DEVELOPMENT OF DAYTIME INSTRUCTION 1954 - 64

Class Instruction

In 1954 when the Language and Area School (then called Language and External Training School, LETS) began to expand its internal facilities, the language teaching faculty consisted of 5 staff instructors giving part-time instruction principally in French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Russian. To supplement these efforts the School was able to obtain various individuals on part-time detail from other parts of the Agency to offer classes in other languages. Classes were taught by this method in Persian, Japanese, Chinese and other languages. Full-time students were being sent to various external facilities.

In 1955, as a result of continuing expressions of interest by SR Division, it was decided to attack the problem of giving full-time instruction internally. A new staff employee was hired in July of 1955 and given the task of developing full-time instruction in Russian. Preparations for this course led to obtaining permission to hire contract instructors for the first time. The first full-time classes in Russian began in late September 1955. The success of this venture

SECRET

led to further attempts in early 1956 with full-time classes beginning in French (March 1956) and German (October 1956). Since that time full-time training has been a very important part of our curriculum, and we have taught full-time courses in 16 languages to 380 students.

One feature of our full-time classes is at least one stay of 3-5 days at [ ] training site. The use of such a site, where the use of the language being taught can be made compulsory on a 24-hour-per-day basis, began with the first full-time German class in 1956. At that time we made use of rented facilities. Unfortunately the third such outing, a French group, met unexpected difficulties in the form of a police raid. The activity was hastily discontinued until August 1957 when we were able to obtain our present site,

[ ]

[ ]

The purpose of these [ ] training exercises is twofold: first, students are given a practical introduction under everyday living conditions of many aspects of the language which they are studying

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

which they do not meet in the classroom; second, the experience of actually living for several days using only the foreign language is a confidence-building device which has no equal.

While the number of full-time students trained is not large, representing only about 10% of directed training and 5% of the total training effort, these courses represent much of the best training which has been done in the Agency. Individuals so trained, along with other language-proficient members of the Agency, have contributed many years of successful overseas service to the Agency. Out of the development of these courses have grown also the materials and the instructor-training support which have contributed indispensably to the part-time training activities of the School.

From the beginning it was apparent that full-time instruction, while necessary, would not completely satisfy the requirements of the Agency. In those schools where full-time training is the rule it has been the practice to utilize one contract instructor approximately 30 hours per week in each course. Since we were faced with requirements for both full-time and part-time classes we hit upon the scheme of using more than one instructor for each full-time class to provide

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

variety in accent and approach for the students and to utilize the remaining time of the instructors for the teaching of part-time classes. Aside from contributing much-needed variety to our full-time classes, this system has helped greatly to keep our contract instructors at near peak performance since they are not subjected to the same class in the same room several hours per day.

The great bulk of Agency training has been done in part-time classes. Most of the part-time classes have the same objective as full-time classes; namely, spoken language proficiency along with ability to read and write. In addition to classes with general objectives a few others have been taught each year whose prime objective was the teaching of reading and translation skills. Specialized classes have consistently made up 10-20% of our teaching load. In the approximately ten-year period here reported LAS has trained more than five thousand students in part-time training during duty hours.

It has always been our policy, in view of the problem of security and clearability of instructors, to develop a highly professional group of contract instructors capable of handling a variety of types of instructional situations. By relying heavily on these instructors we have been

SECRET

able to keep the number of our staff instructors to a minimum. Our professional Staff positions now number no more than nine. To them has been left the job of planning and coordinating instruction, developing materials, and, not least, the training and professional development of contract instructors. The ultimate result of this process can be seen in the support which the daytime program has been able to give to the Voluntary and Tutorial Programs in terms of materials and instructor training, without which it would have been difficult or impossible to run the programs. In addition to the support of headquarters programs we are able to supply tapes and texts to support language training activities in the field. Hundreds of manhours per year are devoted to this activity. Our present faculty numbers nine staff instructors, and eighteen full-time and four part-time contract instructors.

In addition to actual teaching the staff has produced a number of highly professional and usable materials for language teaching. These materials and the accompanying tape recordings are the distillation of years of experience in practical language teaching. Many of our materials are equal or superior to many which have been highly praised and widely used in the profession. Materials production is not



SECRET

a one-time affair, it is a continuous process of applying lessons learned and new discoveries in the field of language teaching to our definition of our mission: "It is our job to apply our experience and skill to the language training requirements of the Agency in the most professional way possible under the circumstances."

#### Tutorial Instruction

In January 1960 the decision was made to supplement our normal training facilities by setting up a roster of language tutors, in as many languages as possible, who would be ready to give tutorial instruction on short notice to students who for various reasons could not be fitted into regular LAS classes. Many such students were still being given training at commercial schools in the area at costs which were excessive. By recruiting primarily wives of staff employees of the Agency it was also hoped that the security of such training could be improved. The two principal categories of students in tutorial training were: (1) those who for reasons of scheduling or other reasons could not be trained in regular classes, or (2) employees in covert status who could not enter Agency premises.

SECRET

SECRET

The first tutors were cleared, and hired on hourly rate contracts, early in February 1960 and by May 1960 tutorial instruction had been given to some 40 students.

The program grew rapidly until early in FY 1964. Between 85 and 100 students were in tutorial training at any one time. This was a result of increasing Agency reliance, particularly by DDP, on the easily available tutorial training, which made advance planning for language training practically unnecessary. The availability of a large cadre of native speakers soon became well known throughout the Agency, and their services were frequently requested for other activities such as the following:

1. Assisting in the DDP/Systems Groups (formerly MMU) Name Grouping Project. About 15 to 20 tutors have assisted in this project since it began early in 1961.
2. Assisting in transliteration projects for RID and other Agency offices.
3. Translation assignments.
4. Testing language proficiency of staff and contract agents off Agency premises.

SECRET

SECRET

5. On a few occasions, acting as interpreters at debriefings.

As the tutorial rush increased in volume, the peak was reached in April 1963 when the cost of tutorial training for one month reached \$8,225, and it remained until August 1963.

In August it became impossible for the Office of Training to budget money for tutorial training and for a period of several months tutorial training was to be charged directly to the using component. At the same time the School made every effort to increase services by combining tutorials into small classes and by scheduling regular Spanish and French classes to begin on the first of each month. By doing this we have been able to service many requests that would previously have been purely tutorial using our regular staff and using tutors only to make up the hours which could not be handled by the regular staff. As a result the number of tutorials for FY 1964 dropped by 100 below the number for the preceding year and the number of tutorials in progress at any given time is between 30 and 40. The cost of the program has leveled off to approximately \$4,500 per month.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

About 800 students have received tutorial training since the beginning of the program. A fairly large number of these students, particularly during 1961 and 1962, were trained for ludicrously short periods, i. e., from 5 to 25 hours. Approximately 75% of tutorial trainees have been from DDP with the remaining 25% from other Agency components. Since the program began, we have employed a total of 100 tutors who have given instruction in 26 languages. An additional 53 were cleared, but their services were never required.

There is little doubt that the advent of tutorial training has increased the flexibility and capabilities of the School. At present we have a total capability of 49 languages in which instruction can be given, plus English teaching and covert training capabilities.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

THE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM 1957 - 63

The Language Awards Program

The Language Development Program, with its central feature, the Language Awards Program, was planned in 1955 and 1956 and went into effect on 4 February 1957. This was an event of signal importance for the Language and Area School. It placed upon the School a number of sharpened demands for services both in teaching and non-teaching fields.

The Awards Program was conceived in the knowledge that other intelligence services pay bonuses for language proficiency. The architects of the program began with the mandate that the awards to be paid under the program were to be paid not for possession of the skill but rather for the expenditure of effort involved in acquiring and maintaining the proficiency. The attempt to write this notion into the implementing regulations and to apply the principles of language difficulty and manner of acquisition and maintenance to the adjudication of cases occasioned much difficulty during the years that the Awards Program was in force. Major emphasis was placed on off-duty acquisition of language competence. During the six years in which the Awards

SECRET

SECRET

Program was in force, approximately \$765, 500 was paid out in awards. Nearly 4000 individuals participated in the program. Nearly 2500 awards were paid for acquisition of new skills and over 3000 awards were paid for maintenance of skills previously acquired.

There appears to be no question that the Language Development Program contributed materially in a general way to the development of language proficiency in the Agency. It is significant that maximum enrollments in LAS programs of training were registered in those years (FY 58 and 59) in which the most money was paid out in awards. Opportunities offered under the Language Development Program for voluntary study of foreign languages almost doubled the total number of people enrolled in language training.

With its emphasis on voluntary learning of language and with the administrative and budgetary limitation under which the Awards program operated it was almost inevitable that it should have fallen somewhat short of the expectations which many held for it. There is room for speculation that the same expenditure of funds and supervision applied to a sharply-focused, workable, overall policy with respect to language training in the Agency might have produced superior results,

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

particularly if such a policy had made it possible to train a small number of carefully selected individuals in less common, but critical languages, such as Vietnamese, Cambodian, etc.

Voluntary Language Training Program (1957 - )

The training offspring of the Language Development Program was the Voluntary Language Training Program which began in May 1957. The Language Development Program offered graduated awards depending upon the relative difficulty of languages and the circumstances under which the languages were learned (i. e., whether they were learned as a result of directed training during duty hours or as a result of voluntary study on the students' own time.) It became immediately apparent that opportunities for learning foreign languages would have to be afforded to those members of the Agency for whom directed training during normal duty hours could not be justified. A study was undertaken by the Language and Area School to determine the most efficient and satisfactory ways of providing this training. Among the alternatives considered were:

1. Contracting with an external institution to give off-duty hours training for selected Agency students.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

2. Contracting for instructors to provide training on Agency premises during off-duty hours.
3. Recruitment of instructors from among Agency personnel with the necessary linguistic qualifications.

The latter method proved to be the most satisfactory from the point of view of cost, security and flexibility, (and control of substance and teaching practices.) It also provided the additional advantage of affording an opportunity for many highly skilled members of the Agency to maintain their proficiency in various foreign languages by acting as instructors in the Program. As it turned out, one of the incidental advantages accrued from the fact that many of the instructors were themselves supervisors in the Agency, and they derived from teaching in the Program a thorough understanding of the problems of language teaching in the Agency. The language classes in the Voluntary Program were conceived as regular classes to be taught on a definite schedule with a definite curriculum, building through a series of part-time classes up to usable proficiencies in terms of Agency proficiency

SECRET



SECRET

standards. The support for this Program in terms of instructor training, provision of materials, and administrative support was provided by the regular staff of the Language and Area School.

During the first two years of its existence the Voluntary Language Training Program was organized in 3 trimesters per year. First classes began on 20 May 1957 with 170 students in 20 classes in seven languages. By the sixth trimester in the Winter of 1959 we had achieved a high point of 61 classes in 16 languages with an enrollment of 372. The highest point in enrollment came in the Fall-Winter semester of 1959-60 with 430 students.

In the Spring of 1960 it was decided to eliminate basic-level classes in French, German, Italian and Spanish because extremely high enrollments in these languages made it appear useful to attempt to entice students to take up less common languages. The result was a drop in enrollment to 237 in 30 classes in 10 languages.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

The situation remained thus until Spring of 1961 when the pressure of demands for out-of-hours basic level classes in common languages caused the reinstatement of these courses in the curriculum. As these courses were reinstated it was recognized that it was desirable to make the transfer from a first or second course in the Voluntary Program into an advanced class in the Daytime Program as easy as possible, since the VLTP was destined to become a basic training ground for many of our students. We therefore introduced into all basic VLTP classes as rapidly as possible the same texts which are being used in regular daytime classes. By now all basic level classes use the same texts as Daytime classes. Since the reinstatement of basic classes in the common languages, enrollments have climbed slightly, but never to the peaks which we experienced in the early days of the program. The present semester has an enrollment of 204 in 25 classes in five languages.

During the 16 semesters (or trimesters) of the Voluntary Language Training Program there have been 4117 student enrollments in 583 classes in 20 languages. This represents about 2700 individual students allowing for the fact that about one-third of the students

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

enrolled for two or more semesters. Of the 2700 individuals about 12% have gone straight through a sequence of courses, have taken a proficiency test, and almost all have registered an immediately useful level of proficiency. Approximately 25% drop out of the program with unsatisfactory performance, attendance, or both. The remaining 63% drop out of the program before finishing a complete sequence of courses, but after achieving a significant start in the language. Our present records and follow-up system are not equal to the task of keeping track of all of these people. A significant number either go into more intensive training, depart PCS for overseas and show up later with a useful proficiency in the language or may later reappear to continue where they left off. There is reason to believe that as many as half of these people do eventually achieve fully usable proficiencies. The remainder have at least a start in the language which would cut down on the lead time necessary to train them to full proficiency if the occasion arose.

SECRET

SECRET

Thus while the Voluntary Program has not lived up to the hopes which many people held for it, it has probably succeeded both in terms of a not inconsiderable number of useful proficiencies and in terms of a potential which we cannot yet precisely measure.

When the cost of the Voluntary Program -- approximately \$35,000 per year -- is reckoned, it is simple to leave out of consideration the support provided to the Program in terms of instructor training and provision of usable and practical teaching materials by the daytime program. Without the support of the daytime program, the Voluntary Program would virtually not have been possible. In return for its efforts, however, the daytime program has gained from the Voluntary Program an insight into various aspects of language training problems which could not be studied as thoroughly in connection with the rather less regular and more harried schedule of the daytime program. The statistics on student aptitudes, attitudes, proficiencies developed and teaching techniques which we have gained from experimentation and careful records-keeping in the Voluntary Program have been of direct help to the daytime program where the opportunity for experimentation was minimal in view of the constant struggle to do the best

SECRET

SECRET

possible job in the least possible time. Thus, the 2 programs have in many respects complemented each other and the 2 together have been able to accomplish more than either would have been able to accomplish alone.

#### Foreign Language Proficiency Testing

The need for wide-range foreign language proficiency testing had been foreshadowed in 1955 with the establishment of some experimental proficiency tests done originally at the request of TSS.

Moreover, there was increasing desire to develop a realistic inventory of the Agency's foreign language assets and recognition that the existing self-evaluations provided on "application for employment" forms were fallible and unreliable. As there was increasing concern in the Agency for language competence as an operational tool and for ascertaining that an officer truly possessed the desired facility, objective evaluation of proficiency became an essential instrument for selection and assignment of personnel.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

The coming of the language awards program made it imperative that methods be found to conduct large numbers of proficiency tests with a reasonable degree of standardization. This small program beginning in connection with testing the Slavic language proficiencies of TSS employees therefore expanded into a considerable amount of research in broad-range proficiency testing which we found to our surprise was rather unique in the language teaching field in the United States. Although beginnings in oral testing had been made at the Foreign Service Institute, we found that there was absolutely no reliable guidance to be had in this field. The only existing tests which we were able to find were the Army's so-called proficiency tests which were exclusively devoted to written language and suffer from many other inadequacies. Such information as we were able to obtain came from

25X1

[redacted] who was already employed as a consultant to the A&E Staff. In several conferences with Dr. [redacted] we developed a number of guiding principles concerning the types of tests which would be required. Prototype tests were composed first in German and then in French, which tests eventually formed the basis for the objective tests in 34 languages which were composed with the aid of language-proficient members of the Agency and contract

25X1

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

employees under the guidance of an LAS staff member, beginning with the end of 1955. The tests which ultimately resulted from this research were the first and only serious attempts in the field to judge as accurately as possible the abilities of individuals in speaking, reading, writing, pronunciation and understanding, measured against the standard of a native speaker of the language concerned. Understandably these tests have shown over a period of time many deficiencies and shortcomings. Nevertheless, they still stand as milestones in the development of the foreign language field.

Testing began in 1957 and rose to a peak at the height of the Language Awards Program in 1959 and 1960. After that, the number of candidates declined in direct proportion to the number of reductions in monetary awards. Oral testing to accompany the written tests has been conducted by interviewing candidates with the aid of volunteer help from language-proficient members of the Agency.

In all, over 10,000 tests have been administered by the testing section. In spite of this the Agency's Language Qualification Register remains one of the darkest corners of the Language Development Program. Of the thousands of claimed proficiencies only about 35-40%

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

have been verified by tests. Although the regulation requires periodic testing of proficiency, it has proven impracticable to find means of administering tests overseas, and compliance at headquarters, in spite of repeated attempts, has not been obtained.

With the advent of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, new experiments were undertaken by the Research Center of the Modern Language Association to produce tests of linguistic proficiency in 5 common languages. As a result of interagency cooperation developed in the Interagency Language Round Table, which will be discussed in another context, it was possible to begin with year-end funds for Fiscal

25X1

[REDACTED]

25X1

[REDACTED] to provide language proficiency tests based upon [REDACTED] tests for both French and Spanish.

Since the launching of the original contract, funds provided by the Defense Language Institute have enabled us to amend the contract to include 2 forms of the test in Russian, which is presently in production. The contract for the French and Spanish tests terminated as of 30 June 1964, and while the resulting tests have not been fully

SECRET



SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

evaluated as yet, they give promise of a more objective standard of measure of foreign language proficiency than we have had heretofore, and it is hoped that these tests can be adopted as a government-wide standard, meaningful also to the academic community for the measuring of linguistic proficiency.

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

SECRET

SECRET

### INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

In 1956 the Chief of the Language and Area School called the first meeting of the Interagency Language Round Table, which was to be an informal, approximately monthly meeting of heads of language training facilities in Government agencies for the purpose of exchanging usable information on facilities, personnel and aids in the field of language training. The organization of the Round Table was purposely kept informal with the rotating chairmanship determined voluntarily at each of the monthly meetings. Much emphasis was placed on the understanding of common problems and recently on common solutions to these problems.

Through the Round Table, Agency representatives were able to know of and use the language courses of other agencies, resulting in significant monetary savings for the Agency. Contacts have also been made recently by this group with the academic community. The result has been widespread dissemination of information on language training problems and techniques which has resulted in minimizing duplication among Government facilities, general agreement on salary scales to be paid to language instructors, general agreement on standards for

SECRET

SECRET

language proficiency, and possible agreement on measures of language aptitude. At present members of the Round Table are engaged in a project aimed at formulating lists of languages for which training requirements exist and for which training materials are not yet developed, with suggested priorities for the development of materials.

25X1

may take over the job of setting down information about existing materials with professional annotation as to the quality of the materials.

The Center for Applied Linguistics is also launching a project for setting up a clearing house for information on and evaluation of automated teaching aids in the field of language training. It is hoped that interagency support can be obtained for this extremely worthwhile project.

There are many other problems in the field which can only be solved, if at all, by the type of cooperation which has been developed as a result of the Interagency Round Table.

SECRET

SECRET

## THE FUTURE OF AGENCY LANGUAGE TRAINING

### Methods

The coming of the oral-aural approach to language training and the use of the language laboratory have given great impetus to foreign language study. The present oral-aural method promises useful results, but it still requires inordinate amounts of time. The language laboratory is the first step in the automation of many aspects of language training. Present materials used in the lab, though considerably refined by comparison with those of ten years ago, are still relatively crude. Experimentation in learning theory which has been in progress for some years shows the way to more refined and more fully automated methods of teaching which give promise of allowing the individual to progress at his own rate and much more thoroughly than was previously believed possible.

Although initial claims by proponents of programmed instruction have proven to be exaggerated, the principles of programmed teaching are already well established. The working out of specific techniques for teaching specific skills and the development of the necessary means of exploiting the principles will undoubtedly be a longer process.

SECRET

SECRET

Be that as it may, the prospect of significant breakthroughs in this area are extremely bright in the coming ten years. The cost of these breakthroughs will be very high and it is important that developments be followed closely and examined critically at every step of the way. The best hope of being able to accomplish this without premature commitment and profligate waste of resources appears to lie in the cooperative approach among agencies, as accomplished by the Round Table. Through this approach access can be had to tested new developments at a minimum cost to each organization. As the proposal to set up a clearing house for information on automated instructional materials briefly outlined above becomes more firmly established, a proposal for modest financial support by the Agency will be made. It is hoped that conditions will permit the Agency to support the project.

#### Language Training Policy

Short of the brave new world of automated teaching described above and in spite of the not inconsiderable accomplishments of the past ten years, the best means by which the Agency can guarantee its linguistic future is to establish policy through which it can forecast its requirements with sufficient accuracy so that it may plan to fill them

SECRET

SECRET

with the resources which it already possesses, or train in as orderly a fashion as possible the necessary persons to make up deficits. The efficacy of such an approach will probably be amply demonstrated in the Armed Forces and in State and USIA where such policies are presently being implemented.

The problem of obtaining such a policy is not one which properly belongs exclusively within the concern of the Office of Training, although OTR has been in the forefront in demanding such a policy. One of the stumbling blocks has been that much of the information on personnel, their skills, and their utilization necessary to the formulation of an intelligent proposal for a policy has not been readily available to the Office of Training. Furthermore, suggestions leading to the obtaining of this information and the formulation of a policy proposal have been tarred with the brush of "vested interest" when they emanated from the Office of Training.

On sober consideration much of the responsibility for the type of personnel planning implied by the idea of a language policy appears to lie with the Office of Personnel. Recently the Director of Personnel has instructed members of his staff to look into the State-USIA policy

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

on language proficiency with a view to its implications for the Agency. Thus far we have cooperated with the Office of Personnel by providing as much information as possible on the State-USIA policy. This approach through the Office of Personnel appears to have promise and it is devoutly hoped that they will not meet with the same obstacles which we have encountered in the past.

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

SECRET

SECRET

## Appendix B

### Language Incentives

23 December 1966

Director of Training

Chief, Language School

Language Incentives

#### I. BACKGROUND

A discussion of incentive awards for language competence in the Agency begins with the Agency Language Development Program and its central feature the Language Awards Program. The planning phase of this endeavor was undertaken at the initiative of the Director, Mr. Allen Dulles, in 1956.

When the implementing directives (see attachment A)\* were issued on 4 February 1957 they provided for the payment of monetary awards ranging from \$25 to \$1200 to individuals who achieved stated levels of proficiency as well as cash awards to those individuals who demonstrated annually thereafter that they had maintained stated levels of proficiency which they had previously acquired. Different awards were specified also for specialized proficiency, i. e. speaking or reading only, as opposed to comprehensive proficiency. The Awards Program was terminated on 1 August 1963.

The Awards Program was conceived in the knowledge that other intelligence services pay bonuses for language proficiency. Major emphasis was placed in the Awards Program on the acquisition of

---

\* The Attachments referred to in this memorandum are not included in this appendix.

SECRET



SECRET

linguistic skills voluntarily, by study during off-duty hours. Awards were also given however for acquisition of skills during duty hours in directed training. The latter awards amounted to half the sum awarded for similar acquisition during off-duty hours.

The architects of the program began with the mandate that the awards to be paid under the program were to be paid not for possession of the skill but rather for the expenditure of effort involved in acquiring or maintaining the proficiency. This was done in an attempt to avoid awards which could be regarded as retroactive to the period prior to the adoption of the program. The attempt to write this notion into the implementing regulations and to apply the principles of language difficulty and manner of acquisition and maintenance to the adjudication of cases occasioned much difficulty during the years when the Awards Program was in force.

The six-year history of the Language Awards Program was one of various attempts to focus it more sharply on the needs of the Agency rather than generally to encourage the acquisition of linguistic skills. These attempts were accompanied also by the pressures of diminishing budgets. The following chronology illustrates the trend in the program:

- 8 December 1958 - Regulation amended to cut amounts of awards in half.
- 5 May 1960 - Regulation revised to cut amounts of awards in half again as of 1 July 1960.
- 14 May 1962 - Cash awards schedule revised again to eliminate maintenance awards, awards for directed training, awards for achievement of proficiency at the elementary level, awards for proficiency in French, German, Italian, or Spanish at any level. (See attachment B)
- 5 August 1963 - Awards program terminated as of 1 August 1963.

SECRET

The whittling away of the awards program undoubtedly left many in the Agency disillusioned about awards programs for acquisition of skills. During the six years in which the Awards Program was in force, a total of approximately \$765,500 was paid out in awards. (See attachment C) Nearly 4,000 individuals participated in the program. Almost 2,500 awards were paid for acquisition of new skills and over 3,000 awards were paid for maintenance of skills previously acquired.

There appears to be no question that the Language Development Program contributed materially in a general way to the development of language proficiency in the Agency. It is significant that maximum enrollments in OTR language training programs were registered in those years (FY 58 and 59) in which the most money was paid out in awards. Opportunities offered under the Language Development Program for voluntary study of foreign languages almost doubled the total number of people enrolled in language training. The majority of the skills attained were low-level skills in the common languages. With the diminution of awards and their final elimination in 1963 the Voluntary Language Training Program (opportunity for language study outside of duty hours) dwindled to the point where it, too, was suspended in September of 1965 and terminated a year later.

## II. CURRENT SITUATION

Present discussion of incentives for the acquisition of language proficiency centers in the Language Development Committee where regulatory issuances are being drafted to implement the Agency's new Language policy. On 1 February 1966 Mr. Helms approved the recommendations of an ad hoc committee on an Agency language policy. (See attachment D) The major thrust of the committee recommendations was to achieve a program for the acquisition and utilization of Agency language proficiency which would place these activities squarely in the long-range planning of the Agency for discharging its missions. The policy requires the Directorates to state their language proficiency requirements by position or position category. The requirements thus established will become mandatory in filling positions on 1 January 1971. It further requires an intensive effort to establish by proficiency testing an accurate register of current

SECRET

language skills. The policy also places requirements on individuals in career categories liable to overseas service. Particular emphasis is placed on language training for Career Trainees who represent a large proportion of the professional younger generation of the Agency.

With respect to incentives the ad hoc committee reported:

"The Group considered the need to provide language incentives for at least two categories of Agency employees: (1) those who in the future bring to the Agency at the time of their appointment a useful foreign language skill and who are expected to serve in language-essential positions, or in career fields requiring periodic service abroad, and (2) those who undertake the study of specific esoteric or "hard" languages in the expectation of accepting assignments involving these languages." The committee was, however, unable to reach agreement on these proposals.

Thus far the Language Policy has been implemented by an Agency notice which concentrates on the immediate tasks to be completed. (See attachment E) The immediate task of the Language Development Committee is the writing of a comprehensive regulation on all phases of the policy. On the subject of incentives for language acquisition, of which there has been much discussion in the Committee, there is substantial agreement on the feasibility and propriety of paying additional increments in the form of step increases to those who enter on duty with usable degrees of proficiency. Substantial disagreement still exists on the payment of increments to individuals already on board.

Major opposition to the proposal to pay incentive increments to those Agency employees who undertake the study of esoteric or "hard" languages has been voiced by the Clandestine Services. The source of some of the opposition is without doubt the disillusionment of many people with the earlier Language Awards Program, coupled with genuine doubt as to the propriety or necessity of incentive payments for only one of several skills required to do a job.

SECRET

SECRET

The basis for argument is the contention that cash awards are no longer needed, that today the real incentive is that if you are language qualified you may get that field assignment you want so badly. The good effort you make in acquiring a better capability is reflected in your fitness report. Your language facility enables you to do a special job for which you are commended or rewarded. Your superior language talents, coupled with your other professional skills, gives you the nod in a time of limited promotions. In other words, the acquisition, possession, utilization and improvement of individual language skills is an integral part of the personnel management and career development processes.

In contrast to the above statement are the policy statements of the Department of State, U. S. Information Agency, and Agency for International Development. For instance, the combined policy statement of State and USIA addresses itself to the problems of incentives as follows:

"There are certain esoteric languages in which the number of applicants chronically falls short of requirements. Acquisition of skills in these languages frequently involves unattractive assignments. Also, the supply of skills in these languages is critically short.

State, USIA and AID all authorize as many as two or three step increases for study and use of skills in esoteric languages, beginning at the time when they are accepted for study of these languages.

Although there is evidence that the Agency has recognized the necessity for placing language-qualified people in field assignments in some areas of the world where hard languages are spoken, notably in the Far East and Near East, (See attachment F) this is by no means universal in Agency practice. In Africa the Agency is still using world languages such as French almost exclusively. In this connection it should be noted that recent gains in training in esoteric languages have been those where immediate assignment to the field is planned. Since the Agency is concerned with crisis spots throughout the world it is necessary to have a backlog of experience in esoteric languages upon which to draw in fast-moving situations where the

SECRET

SECRET

necessarily long-lead time for such training is not available. Any system of incentives should be designed to attract people to training in hard languages, to motivate them to maintain their proficiencies while engaged in other pursuits, and to use them in posts of assignment where conditions are often less than ideal.

Proposals for language incentives currently under consideration for personnel of grade GS-12 or below are as follows:

1. Increase in entrance salary of 1 step increase for those individuals who have at least an intermediate proficiency in French, German, Italian, or Spanish at the time of entrance on duty; increase in entrance salary by one step increase for those individuals who have an elementary proficiency in a priority language or by two step increases for those who have an intermediate proficiency at the time of entrance on duty.
2. Personnel already on duty who enter into 6 months' study of a priority language will upon satisfactory completion of the course receive an in-grade increase of one step. A further step increase will be given upon certification by COS of a post where the priority language is spoken that the individual is satisfactorily using the priority language of that post in his duties. A second increase will be granted upon similar certification during a second tour at the post, or another post where the priority language is used.

The system of incentives described above are calculated to reward individuals who bring language proficiencies to the Agency upon entrance on duty, or who engage in the study and use of a priority language in their Agency assignments. The postponement of second and third step increases will tend to guarantee maintenance of the skill once it is acquired. Use increases would also be paid to individuals who entered on duty with skills in priority languages, the awarding of step increases as described above is infeasible because of ceiling and average grade requirements, the same ends could be achieved by the payment of one time lump sum cash payments instead of step increases.

SECRET

SECRET

It is my firm belief that such a system of incentives is necessary to ensure that the Agency will have sufficient skills in foreign languages, particularly the esoteric or "hard" languages, to carry out its missions in the world's troubled areas. I calculate that the payment of such incentives would cost the Agency an average of \$40,000 per year over the next five years, assuming that 50 individual increases averaging \$300 were made each year.



25X1

Enclosures:

See attachments A-F

Distribution:

Orig and 3 - Addressee (with encls.)

- 1 - C/LS
- 1 - DC/LS
- 1 - Chrono
- 1 - Subj

25X1 OTR/LS  (23 Dec 66)

SECRET

Appendix C

Sources

1. OTR Notice 1-65, 12 Jan 65, ☐ 25X1
2. Memo, Chief, LETS to DTR, sub: Creation of Coordinators within  
25X1 LETS, 13 Dec 55, ☐ (in files of OTR Historian).
3. OTR Report of Significant Activities, Fiscal Year 1956, undated,  
25X1 ☐ (in files of OTR Historian).
4. Memo, DTR to AD/DDI; C/OPS/DDP; Chiefs, Senior Staffs, DDP;  
Chief, Admin DDP; Chiefs, Area Divisions, DDP; Chiefs, Admin  
Offices, DDA; AD/Personnel; AD/Communications; all Training  
and Training Liaison Officers, sub: Standards for Intensive Lan-  
25X1 guage Training, 26 Jan 55, ☐ (in files of OTR Historian).  
25X1
5. CIA Reg. ☐ 4 Feb 57, ☐ 25X1
6. DTR's Tenth Anniversary Address, 14 Dec 60, S (in files of OTR  
Historian).
7. CIA Notice ☐ 4 Feb 57, ☐ 25X1
8. Memo, DTR to DDS, sub: Management Activity in the Office of  
Training in Fiscal Year 1961, Attachment M, p. 36, 13 Oct 61,  
25X1 ☐ (in files of OTR Historian).

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

25X1

11. CIA Reg.

12. CIA Reg.

13. CIA Reg.

14. CIA Reg.

15. CIA Notice

16. Memo, C/AIB/RS/TR to C/LT/LAS, sub: Final Report of Language Awards Money, 20 Jul 64, [ ] (in files of OTR Historian).

25X1

17. Memo, DTR to DDCL, sub: Indoctrination of Dependents Prior to Overseas Assignment of Agency Personnel, 4 Nov 54, [ ] (in files of OTR Historian).

25X1

18. Working Paper prepared by [ ] "Area Training in OTR, 1955 - 1965: A Tabulation of Highlights from Staff's Working Files," 1 May 70, p. 1, not classified (in files of OTR Historian).

25X1

19. Ibid., p. 2.

20. Memo, DTR to DDS (8, above) Attachment M.

21. Ibid.



22. Memo, C/LAS to DTR, sub: Analysis of the Problem of Americans Abroad Orientation, 26 Jun 64, [ ] (in Area Training files 25X1  
25X1 retained by Dr. [ ] in OTR School of Intelligence and World Affairs).
23. Memo, DTR to DDS, sub: Americans Abroad Orientation, 15 Jul 25X1  
64, [ ] (in Area Training files; see 22, above).
24. Memo, C/PPS to DTR, sub: Americans Abroad Orientation, 18 25X1  
Sep 64, [ ] (in Area Training files; see 22, above).
25. OTR Notice 1-65, 12 Jan 65, [ ] 25X1
26. Memo, C/LAS to DTR, sub: The Helms Proposal, 20 Aug 58, [ ] 25X1  
(in files of OTR Historian).
27. Ibid.
28. Working Paper by [ ] (18, above). 25X1
29. Memo, DTR to DDP/TRO, undated (but internal evidence indicates 25X1  
Oct or Nov 59), [ ] (in Area Training files; see 22, above).
30. Ibid.
31. Working Paper by [ ] (18, above). 25X1
32. OTR Notice 1-65, 12 Jan 65, [ ] 25X1
33. Written comments by [ ] (in files of 25X1  
OTR Historian).

34. Notes on telephone conversation with Dr. [ ] 3 Feb 71, 25X1  
(in files of OTR Historian).
35. OTR Notice 20-56, 15 Jun 56, [ ] 25X1
36. Report of OTR Activities, Fiscal Year 1956 (3, above).
37. Memo, DTR to Chief, Management Staff, sub: Office of Training  
25X1 Reorganization, 9 Aug 56, [ ] (in files of OTR Historian).
38. Ibid., Attachment 3.
39. OTR Bulletin, "The School of International Communism," Mar 67,  
25X1 p. 21, [ ]
40. OTR Catalog, Clandestine Services Headquarters Use Only, Jan  
25X1 57, p. 0-6, [ ]
41. Ibid.
42. OTR Bulletin, Mar 67 (39, above).
43. Ibid.
44. Memo, C/SIC to C/PPS/OTR, sub: Report to the President's  
Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities (Hull Com-  
mittee) - 30 September 1959 - 31 March 1960, 25 Mar 60, [ ] (in 25X1  
files of OTR Historian).
- 25X1 45. Memo, PPS/OTR to [ ], sub: OTR History, 26  
25X1 Mar 62, [ ] (in files of OTR Historian).

46. OTR Bulletin, Mar 67 (39, above).

47. Memo, C/SIC to C/PPS/OTR (44, above).

48. Ibid.

49. Memo, C/SIC to C/PPS, sub: Weekly Activity Report No. 17, 28

25X1 Apr 60, [ ] (in files of OTR Historian).

50. Memo, C/SIC to C/PPS, OTR, sub: Report to the President's  
Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities (Hull Com-  
mittee) - 1 April - 30 September 1960, 4 Oct 60, [ ] (in files of  
OTR Historian).

25X1

51. Report of OTR Activities, Fiscal Year 1964, Oct 64, [ ] (in files of  
OTR Historian).

25X1

52. Memo, C/SIC to C/PPS/OTR (44, above).

53. Weekly Activities Reports from C/SIC to C/PPS/OTR covering  
the period from Apr 60 to May 63, [ ] (in files of OTR Historian).

25X1

54. Memo, C/SIC to C/PPS/OTR (50, above).

55. Memo, C/SIC to C/PPS/OTR, sub: SIC Contribution to Report to  
President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, 5 Oct 62, not  
classified (in files of OTR Historian).

56. Ibid.

57. Memo, C/SIC to C/PPS/OTR (50, above).

58. Weekly Activity Report No. 19 from C/SIC to C/PPS, 16 May 61,

25X1

☐ (in files of OTR Historian).

59. Weekly Activity Report No. 20 from C/SIC to C/PPS, 23 May 61,

25X1

☐ (in files of OTR Historian).

60. Weekly Activity Report No. 24 from C/SIC to C/PPS, 16 Jun 60,

25X1

☐ (in files of OTR Historian).

61. Weekly Activity Report No. 18 from C/SIC to C/PPS, 9 May 61,

25X1

☐ (in files of OTR Historian).

62. Weekly Activity Report No. 24 from C/SIC to C/PPS, 26 Jun 61,

25X1

☐ (in files of OTR Historian).

25X1

63. Report of OTR Activities, Fiscal Year 1964, Oct 64, ☐ in files of  
OTR Historian).

**Secret**

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5

*CIA Internal Use Only*

*Access Controlled by DDS*

**Secret**

Approved For Release 2003/05/28 : CIA-RDP93-00791R000100050001-5